

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
FEBRUARY 18, 1997 - 3:00 PM
MICHIE ANNEX CONFERENCE ROOM

AGENDA

A. MINUTES

January 21, 1997 Minutes

B. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATIONS

1. **BAR -97-02-06 Union Station
Site/Landscape Plan and Roof Material Clarification
Townsquare Associates, Applicant**

2. **BAR 97-02-05 Water Street Flats
New Commercial Building
Chuck Lewis, Applicant**

3. **BAR 97-02-04 Virginia Civil War Trails
Trail Blazer Signs
Ms. Cochran**

C. OTHER BUSINESS

1. **For Your Information**
 - a. **Mall Lighting - Replacement Schedule**
 - b. **Training Opportunities**

2. **Discussion**
 West Main Street Design Guidelines

D. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

E. SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

F. ADJOURNMENT

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
FEBRUARY 18, 1997

Members Present

Todd Bullard, Vice Chairman
Dawn Thompson
Blake Caravati
Eldon Wood

Staff Present

Satyendra Singh Huja
Marcia Joseph

3:08 PM The meeting began.

BAR -97-02-06 Union Station

Staff presented the report then Mark Keller representing the applicant discussed the site work proposed including the phasing for the parking areas, the future plans to construct a building directly adjacent to West Main Street, and reasons for locating the plants on the site.

The Board determined that they would withhold discussion on the site work proposed until the project had been reviewed by the Planning Commission.

The applicant had also requested clarification of the Board's previous approval of the roofing material for the baggage building. The Board had voted to approve the use of asphalt shingles as an acceptable temporary solution until the main building is substantially renovated, at which time the roofing materials will be reevaluated.

Mr. Silverman requested that the Board allow the use of the asphalt shingles as a permanent measure or require slate.

Mr. Wood asked what the original roof material was.

Doug Gilpin said that a drawing done in the early 20th Century referred to repairing the roof with slate to match the original.

Mr. Bullard then opened the discussion to the public.

Mr. Danielson stated that he felt it was unreasonable to ask some one to come back and put another roof on. He felt this condition created a definite economic hardship.

Mr. Caravati asked staff to comment on the roof material.

Mr. Huja stated that if the BAR were requiring a material on one it should be required on the other. He asked if both buildings were acceptable with asphalt shingles.

Mr. Wood stated that if the original material had been slate that it had been a long time since the slate had been on the building. He felt that the asphalt shingle was acceptable but it should not be considered a precedent for any other part of the development.

Mr. Wood then moved to:

- 1) Have a committee consisting of Board members Todd Bullard and Eldon Wood administratively approve the heavy asphalt shingle for the baggage building.**
- 2) Remind the applicant that approval of the asphalt shingle for the baggage building was not to be considered precedent setting on the site.**
- 3) Encourage the applicant to pursue obtaining a Historic Preservation low interest loan to repair the roof.**
- 4) Approve the use of slate as an alternative acceptable material for the roofing.**

The motion was seconded by Mr. Blake Caravati and approved unanimously (4:0).

3:45 PM Mr. Huja left the meeting.

The BAR then discussed the phasing of the parking area with Mark Keller. Mr. Keller stated that the phase one parking was the lot adjacent to the existing buildings, phase two was the temporary lot, and phase three was the lot under the bridge.

The Board agreed to wait to discuss the site plan until it had been reviewed by the Planning Commission.

A proposal to use gas lighting was presented by Doug Gilpin. He asked if the Board would consider gas lamps as a design element on the site. The Board's general reaction was favorable, however, the Board requested additional information concerning the lamps including:

- 1) The style, size and location of the lamps.**
- 2) Information concerning the lumen output.**

BAR 97-02-05 Water Street Flats

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Gerry Dixon then responded by stating that the mechanical equipment would be nestled behind the parapet roof and not be visible. He said that they had not chosen a color of glass for the panels in the front of the building. He further stated that the lighting would be located below the gable. It would wash down on the building. The color of the balustrade on the balcony and the wrought iron gate would be gray.

The discussion then focused on the black slate proposed as a vertical element.

Mr. Dixon explained that he wanted the slate to act as a dramatic reveal. He felt it was an opportunity to introduce something different. He said he wanted to add something other than dryvit.

He said that the window glass would be a cool gray color.

Mr. Bullard said he was uncertain about how the precast cornice material would be configured to enclose the upper lights. Mr. Bullard indicated that he would reserve judgment until additional details were provided. However, Mr. Bullard felt somewhat uncomfortable with the concept of the cornice material protruding to encase light fixtures. A light fixture specifically designed for indirect lighting may be simpler, more economical and aesthetically preferable.

Mr. Bullard then asked if there was public comment.

There was none and the issue was before the Board.

There were questions concerning the white colors of the windows and the concrete. Concern was expressed that the gable line seemed timid.

Mr. Dixon replied that the white colors on the windows and in the concrete would closely match each other and that the concrete was 6" thick.

The discussion that followed focused on the size of the tree required. Mr. Dixon stated that he was not sure if it was possible, because of the area constraints, to plant a tree with a root ball larger than 3 feet.

Mr. Bullard then moved to:

1) Have a committee consisting of Board members to meet on the site and administratively review and approve the:

- a. Brick panels.**
- b. Tinted glass.**

- c. **Dark Gray railing and wrought iron fence.**
- d. **Details for proposed lighting.**
- e. **Tree proposed with a size matching the trees flanking the Ice Park as close as possible in size.**

The motion was seconded by Mr. Blake Caravati and approved unanimously (4:0).

BAR 97-02-04 Civil War Trails

Staff read the report.

Ms. Barbara Cochran responded to the staff report and stated that they might be able to reduce the number of Trailblazer signs and replace them with red, white and blue arrows.

The Board discussed the concept of matching city standard signs and the content of the interpretive sign.

Mr. Caravati moved to:

1) Have a committee consisting of one Board member (Mr. Caravati) and Mr. Huja administratively review and approve the:

- a. **Trail Blazer sign post**
- b. **Location and number of signs**
- c. **Park trail name designation**
- d. **Text of the interpretive information park signs**

The motion was seconded by Mr. Eldon Wood and approved unanimously (4:0).

ICE PARK SIGN

Staff presented the proposed neon sign to the Board.

Mr. Wood stated that he felt that the colors on the sign were not consistent with any other colors in the downtown area.

The Board agreed that the neon sign was not something that they could approve.

Mr. Bullard said that he would like to defer comment until the sign and the area were considered more carefully.

Staff informed the Board that the Mall lights were not being replaced in groups of four on each pole. The supplier has not been able to meet our demand, because the lights leaked, many lights have failed. The public works department is replacing the lights that have burnt out first.

The Board agreed to review the Minutes from the January 21, 1997 meeting at their next meeting in March.

Meeting adjourned 4:50 PM.